

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL COAST REGION**

STAFF REPORT FOR REGULAR MEETING OF MAY 30-31, 2013
Prepared on April 15, 2013

ITEM NUMBER: 8

SUBJECT: Rescission of Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 89-117 for Yanke Energy (Formerly Soledad Energy Partnership), Forest and Agricultural Waste Fueled Power Plant, Soledad, Monterey County

KEY INFORMATION

Discharger: Yanke Energy (Current Owner)
Location: 959 Los Coches Drive, Soledad
Type of Waste: Boiler Blowdown and cooling water waste
Design Flow: 120,000 gallons per day
Current Flow: None
Treatment: 1) Discharge before salts are concentrated, or 2) Dilution
Disposal: 50-acre land disposal site near Salinas River
Recycling: None
Existing Order: Order No. 89-117

This Action: Rescind Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 89-117

SUMMARY

Waste discharge requirements Order No. 89-117 is no longer necessary because the power plant was taken off-line in mid-2006 and has no plans to restart in the near future. The Discharger requested a rescission. Staff inspected the facility and proposes a rescission of the waste discharge requirements.

DISCUSSION

In 1989, the Water Board adopted waste discharge requirements for the seven-acre, 13.5-megawatt, wood-waste burning electric electrical power plant located on the south side of the City of Soledad. The power plant generated boiler blowdown and cooling wastewater that was discharged to a 50-acre disposal site located adjacent to the Salinas River and about one mile from the plant. Waste products discharged included salts concentrated in the steam-making process and low concentrations of chemicals used as boiler corrosion inhibitors and biocides. Chemicals used to control corrosion included potassium hydroxide (caustic potash), phosphonic acid (1-hydroxylthylidine), and 1-h-benzotriazole (tolyltriazole), which are reportedly non-toxic in low concentrations in the discharge. Also, 2,2 dibromo3-nitrilopropionamide was used as a biocide.

Since WDRs were adopted, the power plant ran intermittently from about 1989 to 1995 and from about 2001 to 2006. The power plant has not run since 2006. Since the Discharger ceased discharging in 2006 and does not plan on discharging any more, the Discharger sent a letter

requesting a rescission. Staff inspected the facility on November 29, 2012, and concluded that the facility

- is not discharging,
- has not discharged for a long time,
- has no stockpiled woodwastes, and
- is in such a state of disrepair that it is unlikely to discharge again.

COMPLIANCE HISTORY

The Water Board's CIWQS database includes the following violations for the power plant:

Description	Violation Date
Failed to submit ROWD	9/1/2002
Sulfate violation; max limit is 500 mg/L; reported value is 910 mg/L.	10/17/2002
TDS violation; max limit is 1500 mg/L; reported value is 1900 mg/L.	10/17/2002
Total Dissolved Solids violation; permit limit is 1500 mg/L; reported value is 1600 mg/L.	7/30/2003
Chloride violation; permit limit is 250 mg/L; reported value is 330 mg/L.	8/5/2003
Effluent chloride violation; permit limit is 250 mg/L; reported value is 310 mg/L.	11/19/2003
Discharge flow violation; permit limit is 120,000 gpd; reported value is 126,464 gpd over a 6 month period.	12/31/2003
Failed to submit report by 07/30/2005	7/31/2005
Failed to submit report by 01/30/2006	1/31/2006

While the discharger had occasional effluent limit violations, the exceedences were not particularly egregious. So, staff did not pursue enforcement to correct the rare, low-level exceedences. Doing so now would not improve water quality.

The "failed to submit" violations resulted in "fail to submit" enforcement letters, reminding the discharger that monitoring reports were past due. As noted above, the power plant ran intermittently from about 2001 to sometime in 2006. Since the discharge was idled, the discharger had no discharge to monitor and was lax in submitting monitoring reports. After receiving our "fail to submit" letters, staff discussed the matter with the discharger. The discharger reported that there was no discharge to monitor. Staff informed the discharger that they needed to submit monitoring reports, even if those reports solely report that there was no discharge.

COMMENTS

Water Board staff issued a March 7, 2013 letter alerting the following entities of the proposed rescission:

- Adela P. Gonzalez, City Manager, City of Soledad

- David Chardavoyne, Interim General Manager, Monterey Co. Water Resources Agency
- Steve Shimek, Chief Executive / Founder, The Otter Project and Monterey Coastkeeper

Also, Water Board staff posted the proposed rescission on the Water Board's "*Tentative Orders, Permits, Complaints, and Resolutions*" web page. At least 30 days were available for commenting. No comments were returned as of the date this staff report was finalized.

RECOMMENDATION

Since the power plant will not generate process wastewater, there is no need for Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 89-117. Staff recommends rescission of Waste Discharge Requirement Order No. 89-117.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Waste Discharge Requirement Order No. 89-117
2. Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Order No. 89-117

TJK
126-01
S:\WDR\WDR Facilities\Monterey Co\Soledad Energy, LLC\Rescission Staff Report.docx
CIWQS Place: 257675